SHRI CHINTAMAN PANIGRAHI: Madam, so far as state pensions are concerned, we cannot tell them that they should have a limit of Rs. 400 or Rs. 300 or Rs. 200. According to their resources they are doing it. About Pondicherry the total number of applications received was 2,802 and out of that we have already sanctioned 1,846. Again; some of these applications we have referred to the State Government of Pondicherry to recommend whether these cases deserve pension. The cases are there. So, once the State Government reports to us according to the guidelines, then we will consider those cases also.

डा बापू कालदाते : मान्यवर, आपने कहा कि दफ्तर के सभी लोग अच्छी तरह से काम करते हैं। हमने 20 दिन पहले एक चिट्ठी लिखी, 30 जुलाई, को, तो कम से कम उसका जवाब तो दे देते कि हम देख रहे हैं। हमने 30 जुलाई को चिट्ठी लिखी 20 अगस्त तक उसका जवाब नहीं आया तो हमने दोबारा उनको लिखा। तो इसको आप देखिए।

If this is the type of efficiency of your officers, then I don't think even hundreds of years will suffice to settle these cases. I have another simple question. About the Hyderabad Struggle, the Screening Committee has finalized its recommendations. My question is, how much time will it take to settle all the cases which have already ben finalized by the Screening Committee?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: I am thankful to the honourable Member. Out of these 6 000 applications that the Hyderabad Special Screening Committee has recommended we have already sanctioned about 4 600 cases. Another 1,400 or 1 600 cases remain and to facilitate their disposal we have even extended the lifetime of the Screening Committee. As soon as possible perhaps within a month or two we are going to finish that thing. About your not receiving a reply, I am very sorry... *(Interruptions)*...

DR. BAPU KALDATE: There is not even the courtesy of acknowledging our letter. That is our difficulty. You have not even the courtesy. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: I am very sorry. I will see that whenever any letter comes, a reply is sent.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You ask him to expedite the matters.

*403. [*The questioners (Shri T. R. Balu and Shri V. Gopalsamy) were absent. For answer,* vide *col.* 28-29 *infra.*]

Minister's visit to Korea and China

*404. DR. BAPU KALDATE:†

DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISH :

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether he visited South Korea and China recently;

(b) if so, what was the purpose of his visit; and

(c) what has been the outcome of the visits?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (c) A statement is placed on the Table of the House.

Statement

(1) The then Minister for External Affairs, Shri N. D. Tiwari, paid an official visit to the Republic of Korea (ROK) from May 17th to 19th, 1987, and a transit visit to the People's Republic of China from June 14th to 16th, 1987.

(2) The official visit to the ROK was in the nature of a return visit

†The questions was actually asked on the floor of the House by Dr. Bapu Kaldate.

following the then ROK Foreign Minister's visit to India in July, 1985. Consultations on bilateral and international issues took place during the visit. Bilateral issues discussed included trade, science and technology and joint ventures. Both sides were of the view that bilateral cooperation could be increased in these fields. The ROK authorities expressed their appreciation of India's role in the Non-Aligned Movement.

(3) During his transit visit to Beijing, China, on his return home from the Non-Aligned Ministerial Meeting at Pyongyang, the then External Affairs Minister exchanged views on matters of mutual bilateral and international concern with the Acting Premier of China, WAN LI, and the Vice Foreign Minister in the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, LIU SHUQING Both sides expressed the desire to improve relations in all fields. While it may take time to settle the boundary question, it was felt that it should be solved through peaceful negotiations in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and that peace and tranquility should be maintained all along the Indo-China boundary.

डा० बापू कालदाते : उपसभापति महोदया, हमें बड़े आश्चर्य की बात लगी कि जो बयान आपने दिया है, उसमें लिखा है कि भूतपूर्व विदेश मंत्री महोदय तीन दिन रहे 14 से 17 जून तक चीन में और 18, 19 ऐसे दो दिन रहे। इसमें यह लिखा है कि वे तो केवल अपनी मार्गस्थ यात्रा के दौरान गये थे। तो मार्गस्थ यात्रा चीन की हुई तीन दिन और जहां आप चर्चा करने के लिए कोरिया में गये वह भी तीन दिन फिर मार्गस्थ यात्रा में आपने कुछ बातें भी की हैं ? तो यह कि मार्गस्थ यात्रा आपका जो भी प्रोग्राम होता है इससे संबंध रखती है या नहीं यह एक मेरा सवाल है, दूसरी बात यह है कि आप अगर दो तीन दिन रहे हैं और आम तौर पर जो आपने लिखा है जो कई सालों से हम सुनते आए हैं कि अत्यन्त स्वस्थ संबंध होने चाहिए, आपस में प्यार तथा भ्रातृभाव की भावना होनी चाहिए तो वह केवल दूसरों के बारे में आप बात करते आए है इससे तो कोई मतलब नहीं निकलता है। हम इतना पूछना चाहते है कि इतना लम्बा मार्गस्थ यात्रा जो चार का रहा इसमें कुछ ठोस बात उन्होंने की या उन्होंने आपको कोई आश्वासन दिया क्या ?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Madam, the hon. Member perhaps knows that the hon. Minister, at that time Foreign Minister and now the Finance Minister, had gone to attend and participated in the Non-aligned Ministerial Bureau Meeting in Pyongyang. As the Member knows, there are only two routes of going to Pyongyang. One is *via* Moscow, and the other is *via* Beijing. So, tne Minister went via Moscow and returned via Beijing. This was a transit visit.

May I mention before I come to this particular point here that th Minister was extended extraordinary courtesies by the Chinese Government. He was made a State guest, and he was given courtesies which usually are not given to Foreign Ministers in transit.

In the course of his stay there, the Foreigr Minister had talks with the leaders of the Chinese Government on bilaterial questions as well as international issues of mutual concern.

वित्त और वाणिज्य मंत्री (श्री नारायण दत्त तिवारी) महोदया आपकी आज्ञा से एक स्पष्टीकरण दे दूं हमारे परम मित्र डा० कालदाते जी को कि दक्षिण कोरिया लिखा गया है मैं दक्षिण कोरिया नहीं उत्तर कोरिया गया था और दक्षिण तथा उत्तर का जरा फर्क हो गया है। उत्तर कोरिया मे मैं 6 दिन रहा। 8 तारीख को पहुंचा और 14 को चला। 6 दिन रहा, उसके हिसाब से वे अनुपात लगाएंगे। वहां से जो वायुयान जाता है उसकी उपलब्धता ऐसी होती थी कि मुझे एक दिन और एक रात्रि वायुयान के मारे ठहरना पड़ा। इसलिए इसमें विरोधाभास है।

डा० बापू कालदाते : इसमें आपने टोक्यो में जो बयान दिया था उसमें यह लिखा था कि मैं अगले महीने जाने के लिए सोच रहा हूं । आपने दिया था । मैं यह सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं कि हाल ही में सोवियत रशिया और चीन की बार्डर के संबंध में जो भी चर्चा होकर विवाद सुलझ गया है..... (व्यवधान) संतोषजनक ऐसा जो अखबार में आया है उसको मद्दे रखते हुए क्या आपकी सरकार भी इस दृष्टि से इस सवाल को हल करने के लिए कोई प्रयास करने वाली है ?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am happy to inform the hon. Member and the House that we are looking forward to talks with the Chinese counterparts on this question before the end of this year.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Sarojini Mahishi is not present. Mr. Vishwa Bandhu Gupta.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether, in the talks the hon. Minister had with the Chinese people, there were discussions on enlargement of the area of co-operation, apart from the border question what specific things were discussed. In North Korea the discussions were about co-operation in trade, science and technology, joint ventures etc. So, were there any discussions held on this issue?

Second, has there been during this period a plan for an increase in the exchange of cultural and other delegations with the Chinese to improve the conditions for an easier settlement of the border issue?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Madam, while we are discussing and looking forward to a settlement and making all efforts for the settlement of the border issue, we are also moving in the direction of greater contacts and exchanges in the trade, cultural, science and technology fields, in fact, all fields in which cooperation can exist between the two great countries of Asia.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, this visit, in diplomatic language was called a 'transit visit', the issues however, that were discussed during this visit are not transitory and that being so, the statement that has been laid on the Table of the House is pure waffle. It is a classical example of the Ministry of External Affairs' ability to use a lot of words to say nothing Madam, there is also a curious reference here to the principle of Panchsheel, which is ironic, because this noble principle actually died a premature death on the bleak heighst of the Aksai Chin in 1962. Madam, following upon the visit by the then External Affairs Minister, the Vice-Foreign Minister of P.R.C. is quoted by the New China News Agency as having said "the only way to avoid unpleasantness and ease the tension along some sections of the border is for the Indian side to withdraw its military personnel who have crossed the actual line of control." This is the statement made by the Vice Foreign Minister in the Chinese Ministry of External Affairs.

Madam, I have therefore, three clarifications to seek: Firstly, what is the Ministry of External Affairs reaction to this statement of Vice Foreign Minister whom the statement itself says the then Minister of External Affairs has conferred, consulted and met with?

Secondly, is it correct that between the line of actual control and the line of forward patrolling, there is a geographical gap and what we are observing is maintenance of troops only up to the line of actual forward patrolling and not on the line of actual control?

Thirdly, which is the line of actual control that the Ministry of External Affairs is asserting? Is it that of

1957, 1958, 1962, 1963 as the line of actual control which the Government of India recognises?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Madam, we use the word 'line of actual control'. The expression itself is self-explanatory. The line of actual present control.....

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Madam, there is a difference between the line of forward patrolling and line of actual control and I want to know where is this line of actual control today? Is it the same line that we were observing in 1957 or is it the line that we were observing in 1962 or is there a difference between the line of actual control and the line of forwarrd patrolling? What does the Chinese Foreign Minister mean in using the words that he has done which are tantamount to giving an ultimatum to India. What is the Ministry of external Affairs reaction to that?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Madam, our reaction is that, it is not a case of ultimatum. It is a case on the part of the Chinese reiterating their position. Their position is not our position. Now, we have got to adjust to these positions. We have got to find a solution and that is how we look at the problem. We have got to find a solution to the border problem in a spirit of negotiations, in a spirit of discussion. That is why, I say and I repeat that we are looking forward to meeting with the Chinese in Delhi before the end of this year.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Madam Deputy Chairman, may I know from the hon. Minister whether it transpired in the dialogue between Mr. N. D. Tiwari and the Chinese Prime Minister that both the Governments felt the need of upgrading the level of bilateral dialogue namely from official level to political level? If it transpired between the two, what have been the further steps taken by the Government of India to upgrade the level of bilateral discussion with China because the 7th round of official level discussion is about to take place in Delhi?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: When the official talks take place, then this point will be kept in mind, namely, the substantial political input.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: No, no. Madam, I asked very specifically whether it transpired between the representatives of the two Governments that both the Governments felt the need of upgrading the bilateral discussion; if so, what steps the Government of India have taken.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Obviously, it is always very useful and particularly, in this question, it is extremely useful and important that the level should be upgraded to a political level. However, there are questions by their very nature, about the delimitation of the actual line of control, delimitation of the border and other such questions, which require an involvement and a great deal of input from the official level. So, what is necessary, therefore, is to combine the both. While the officials will be doing what is necessary for them to be done, this major political input will be there. That is the assurance I can give at this point in this House as to in what form it will be evolved just before the talks actually take place.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Madam Deputy Chairman, in the transit stay discussion while it was felt that there should be caution and the boundary question should be discussed at length, was it raised either by the Indian side or by the Chinese side regarding other bilateral issues like trade centres, namely opening of Consulate General offices both in India and China and if so, what steps have been taken either by China or by India in furtherance of this? If it has not figured, why? Was there any attempt made by the Chinese in this regard?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I have replied to this question. Yes, other issues were discussed, the question of

trade, culture and so on. Specifics were not discussed but in the generality, discussion took place and in furtherance of the discussion, we are working in that direction and cooperation between the two countries is taking more concrete shape than ever before.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI: Madam, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether in his talks at Beijing, the matter which is causing a great concern in this country was discussed, specially, the matter regarding the missiles in Lhasa. It seems there are about 100 missiles which are facing 100 cities in the north of India as per the newspaper reports. I would like to know whether this matter was brought to the notice of the Chinese Government and if so, what did they say about it?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Madam, China has denied this as rumour and said it is not based on truth. I would like to add, however, that all matters concerning our security environment and the security of the country are being constantly monitored and adequate precautions and steps are being taken at all levels.

Amendment of Indian Trade Unions Act

*405. SHRI SURESH PACHOURI:†

SHRI CHITTA BASU:

Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have any proposal to amend the Indian Trade Unions Act, 1926 in order to check the multiplicity of trade unions; and

(b) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI AJIT PANJA) on behalf of THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR: (a) and (b) A number of amendments are proposed to be made to the Trade Unions Act, 1926 and the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. These include increase in the minimum membership for registration of a trade union, further restriction on the number of office bearers from among non-workmen, provision for collective bargaining agent|council for a unit or an industry for a specified term and increase in the payment of subscription by members of trade unions.

†The question was actually asked on the floor of House by Shri Suresh P chousi.

श्री सरश पचौरी : मैडम, जस्टिस गजेन्द्र गडकर की अध्यक्षता में गठित राष्ट्रीय श्रम आयोग ने 28 अगस्त, 1969 को अपनी रिपोर्ट सरकार को दी थी। इस आयोग ने एक नेशनल इंडस्ट्रियल रिशलेन्ज कमीशन नेशनल एवं स्टेट लैवल पर बनाए जाने की सिफारिश की थी। क्या सरकार ने इस संबंध में कोई निर्णय लिया है। यदि हां, तो उसका विवरण क्या है ? यदि नहीं, तो इस संबंध में वह कब तक निर्णय लेने के बारे में विचार कर रही है ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Question Hour is over.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Labour Courts/Industrial Tribunals

*403. SHRI T. R. BALU:

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY:

Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether, at the State Labour Ministers' Conference held in the recent past, any decision was taken to double the present strength of Labour Courts|Industrial Tribunals in each State;

(b) if so, what are the names of the States which have since implemented the decision|recommendation in this regard; and

(c) what steps are being proposed to speed up justice in regard to the cases pertaining to the industrial disputes pending in Labour Courts and